

# Board Member Questions and Answers

Prior to Oct. 18, 2023, Board Meeting

## Progress Monitoring of Interim Goals 1.1, 1.2, 1.3: Early Literacy

Yazzie/Martinez students and African American students were given a combined overall percentage score for interim goal 1.1, 1.2 & 1.3? Rationale? The scores were disaggregated for the 2 groups & shown in the goal 1 data? Can you detail those numbers further? What was the process for arriving at one score for both demographics? Does APS know how each distinct group is performing academically? Were these two demographics grouped as one score because of their similarities? Were differences taken into consideration if you saw any? Yazzie/Martinez student scores for these interim goals and for the African American students are those presented in the data documents?

The rates provided in the Goal 1 supplementary tables provide information disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, special education status, English Learner (EL) status, and economic status for Goal 1, as well as each of the interim goals.

Page 1 of the SAPR Report: The numbers show 22.6% of Yazzie/Martinez & 66.0% of other students as advanced, so who are the other 11.4% 3rd grade students and the assumption is they are not advanced? Explain the process by which you arrived at the overall 32.3% total as being advanced?

The rates shown represent the percentage of students who scored proficient or above grade level as a student group.

Overall, there were a total of 5,230 students, of which 1,053 were SWD students & 4,173 regular & gifted, which is 5,226 so did 4 students either move, not take the summative assessment or there's another reason for them not being included?

Students with missing data at the time of the assessment were not included in this breakdown.

### Interim Goal 1.1:

What is the validity of iStation for kindergarteners?

iStation has been a state-vetted assessment with national norming and has been used since required by NMPED.

What other monitoring tools were considered for kindergarten?

In this dataset, only iStation data was used. Kindergarten teachers also use the KOT (Kindergarten Observation Tool) to assess student learning.

In our community engagement with the development of our goals and guardrails, we heard from a sizable portion of the community that there was a desire for multiple measures in assessment and a desire to NOT return to the high-stakes testing of NLCB. How do our interim goals reflect those concerns?

As a district, we adhere only to the required federal and state formative and summative assessments. Teachers utilize multiple formative assessment measures throughout their lesson and unit plans.

How does the district ELA curriculum reflect developmentally appropriate practices as described by the National Association for the Education of Young Children?

Albuquerque Public Schools uses HQIM from the approved list provided by the NMPED. A highly comprehensive process is used to vet these materials for district use. Teachers also use their professional judgment to differentiate instruction based on the developmental needs of their students.

### Interim Goals 1.2 and 1.3

I have basically the same questions for 1.2 and 1.3 that I had for 1.1. I understand the role that Istation plays for the state, but I have never seen validity data from any source other than Istation itself.

Please see above.

Do we have any data for students in dual language programs in their Spanish literacy?

The district uses the STAMP assessment by AVANT to measure Spanish language proficiency. Spanish proficiency is not something that we are measuring in Goal 1.

What formative assessments are being used in the classroom?

Teachers at all grade levels should be formatively assessing students every day through instructional tasks that should be aligned to the state-required standards. District-adopted HQIM also have formative assessments that teachers may use to gauge student learning throughout lessons and units of study.

At the last board meeting public forum we heard from a teacher who shared the difficulties in having no time for professional collaboration and the impact it has on instructional practice. Are there proposals for addressing this going forward in order to minimize impact on instruction?

The bell-to-bell schedules have created a very tough situation for APS, especially at the elementary level. The legislative increase from a 990-hour minimum to an 1140-hour minimum has made scheduling so tight that there is no additional time for before and after-school supervision or consistent professional development. We currently have seven days of district and site-based PD, but it is not what anyone is used to. We no longer have the ability to have early release Wednesdays, and the 7-hour teacher contract day does not give us any flexibility. We have heard that the Governor may require 190 days instead of hours, which could help us, but that is an unknown certainty at this time.

High school teachers teach five out of seven class periods, which provides them with a personal prep as well as a collaborative prep. This costs the district around \$10 million per year. It would be great to expand this collaborative time to middle and elementary schools, but it is currently not financially feasible.

As we begin working on the development of next year's calendar, we will continue to problem-solve solutions to challenges created by this change in legislation.